DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 194 CS 506 037

AUTHOR Tate, Eugene D.; McConnell, Kathleen
TITLE Restoring "Speech" and "Time" to Communication Theory: Contributions of Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Convention of the World Communication Association (Norwich, England, August 3-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Processes; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; *Interpersonal Communication; Speech Communication; Theories; *Time Factors (Learning)
IDENTIFIERS *Rosenstock Huessy (Eugene); *Rosenzweig (Franz); Speech Thinking

ABSTRACT

It has been said that the contribution of Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy to the social sciences is their understanding of speech and time. Rosenstock-Huessy criticized modern communication theory because it assumes that one communicates to express thought, claiming instead that because speech necessitates the presence of a listener, to speak is to call forth a response or to respond to another person. Franz Rosenzweig expanded this with his concept of "speech thinking," which is spontaneous and requires someone who responds, in contrast to traditional "thinking" which is prepared and requires no one in particular to respond. Modern communication scholars agree with this, but rely on thought to the extent of denying a proper understanding of communication. In the area of time, Rosenstock-Huessy distinguished two types, which are related to different types of knowledge: technological time, knowledge of which is learned quickly, and fruitful time, which is learned only over a long period of time. He claimed that all learning and relational development occur in fruitful time, and that the understanding of the fruitful time concept is required to understand the role of interpersonal communication in relational development. Restoring this logic of speech and time to interpersonal communication theory eliminates much of the irrelevancy of modern communication theory. (Notes and a four-page bibliography are attached.) (Author/SKC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290194

RESTORING "SPEECH" AND "TIME" TO COMMUNICATION THEORY:

CONTRIBUTIONS OF FRANZ ROSENZWEIG AND EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eugene D. Tate

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Eugene D. Tate
and
Kathleen McConnell
St. Thomas More College
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 0W6
Canada

Presented at Biennial Convention of
World Communication Association
3 - 8 August 1987
Norwich, England

CS501237

ABSTRACT

Restoring 'Speech' and 'Time' to Communication Theory:
Contributions of Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

It has been said that the contribution of Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy to the social sciences is their understanding of speech and time. In this paper these two aspects of their work are explored. Rosenstock-Huessy criticized modern communication theory because the assumption is made that one communicates to express thought. This seminal thinker affirmed that a proper understanding of speech necessitates the presence of a listener. Therefore to speak is to call forth a response or to respond to the other person. Franz Rosenzweig expanded this understanding with his concept of "speech thinking." Speech Thinking is spontaneous and requires someone who responds in contrast to traditional "thinking" which is prepared and requires no one in particular to respond. Speech Thinking requires not a frame of reference but a field of correspondence between the communicators. The Logic of Speech requires an understanding of communication as a social process. While modern communication scholars agree with this statement their reliance on thought [thinking thinking, in Rosenzweig's terms] as the foundation of communication denies a proper understanding of process.

Criticisms leveled by North American social scientists of developmental theories often arise from a misunderstanding of time. This criticism arises from the desire to put strict month or year levels as requirements to growth. Yet as Rosenstock-Huessy says in **The Origin of Speech**, there are two kinds of knowledge and two kinds of growth. One type of knowledge is rooted in technological time and is learned quickly. The other is rooted in slow, "Fruitful Time," and is learned only over a long period of time. All learning and relational development occur in Fruitful or Slow Time. To understand the role of interpersonal communication in relational development the concept of Fruitful Time is necessary. Rosenstock-Huessy drew on his analysis of people speaking with one another to develop an understanding of Fruitful Time. By restoring the "logic of speech and time" to Interpersonal Communication Theory much of the irrelevancy of modern communication theory is removed. While this paper does not explore all the implications of Rosenstock-Huessy and Rosenzweig's work for communication theory it does make some suggestions for the development of a theory of interpersonal communication based on these two concepts.

RESTORING "SPEECH" AND "TIME" TO COMMUNICATION THEORY: CONTRIBUTIONS OF FRANZ ROSENZWEIG AND EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

> How can a human being teach credibly of history, society or language in monologues? Only a human being who has lived and experienced the thou and the we in their fullness can reveal the secret of the university" (Kurt Ballerstedt)

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy (1888 - 1973) and Franz Rosenzweig (1887 - 1929) provide a necessary reorientation to Communication Theory which is based on their grasp of speech as "the life blood of society" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 10). Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and Franz Rosenzweig based their entire social theory on the reality of Communication (Stahmer, 1968; Tate, 1986) yet few communication scholars are aware of their major contribution to the field. When one examines Communication Theory in light of the seminal work done by these two creative social theorists, one begins to understand the limitations of modern Communication Theory. As we approach the celebration of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy's one hundredth birthday (1988) it is hoped that the contributions of this seminal scholar will be acknowledged to the same extent as those made by his friend, Martin Buber.

A major contribution of Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy to the social sciences is their understanding of <u>speech</u> and <u>time</u>. In this paper the two-fold aspect of their work will be explored. We will focus on the need for an understanding of "speech thinking" (Rosenzweig) and "grammatical thinking" (Rosenstock-Huessy). The contributions of Rosenstock-Huessy to communication theory have been explored in previous papers (Tate, 1985; Tate 1986; Tate and McConnell, 1986) and therefore are not thoroughly explored here.

The fundamental question which underlies this exploration is "Why do people communicate with one another?" An accepted proposition in Communication Theory, is that one communicates to express one's thoughts. A review of one hundred-twenty six definitions of communication show (Dance and Larson, 1976; Dance, 1967, 1970) that communication is defined esentially as the expression of thought. The term is defined as speech to further understanding; use power; transfer information; or the reduction of uncertainty. These are all central to thought as the basic reason for communication. Even the Phenomenological-Transactional perspective of Stewart and D'Angelo understands communication as something one does with another person in "offering definitions or images of themselves and responding to the definitions or images of the other(s) which they perceive" (1980, 16). Thought is involved because as the transactional event is occurring "each is defining himself or herself in relationship to the other persons involved" (p. 17). Therefore, traditionally communication has been defined as a transactional process in which thought is expressed from one person to another.

In contradistinction Rosenstock-Huessy challenged modern communication theory by questioning the assumption that the only reason to communicate is to express thought (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a; 1981, 14). He believed that we communicate because that is the basic reality of life. People do communicate! They do not speak to communicate thought but speak in response to the other person. Speech comes before thought; thought must be understood as consisting of speech in relation to the other person.

This is a basic breakthrough (Axelrod, 1979) for the social sciences which Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy discovered on the Battlefield of Verdun during the First World War. Rosenstock-Huessy (1969; 1970b) came to understand that a valid social science must reject the Cartesian maxim that thought is the basis of all life. He argued that the foundation of life is communication/response with the people who call us forth by speech. We do not speak to express our thoughts! We speak in response to the other person who first addresses us. Through this speech we come into relationship with other people. Life is to be understood in the narrative which develops spontaneously between people in relationship with one another. For example, in his three volume biography of Martin Buber, Maurice Friedman argues that one cannot write biography but only "dialography" because one can understand the life of another person only in relation to the people and "meetings of (one's) life" (Friedman, 1981, xiv). This denies the evolutionary, developmental, processural approach of traditional biography. People do not evolve over time but respond to the people and events with whom, and in which, they are involved. This is to, as Friedman asserts, "see the life <u>in</u> the event" and understand the "profound two-sidedness of every event."

The rejection of Aristotelian and Cartesian foundations is basic to the "breakthrough" (Axelrod, 1979) which these two seminal thinkers provide for Communication Theory. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy once said that the academic community could not accept his work because he contradicted the very foundation of their understanding of personhood (Rome and Rome, 1964; Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969, 1970a, 1970b). Other scholars have asserted that the fault lies in the Western understanding of science which treats people as mechanical automatons inextricably controlled by natural law or cultural determinism (Ford, 1975; Rorty, 1979; Harre and Secord, 1972; Harre, 1983; Harre and d'Carlo, 1985; Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy were forerunners of this revolution taking place in the social sciences today. They understood that there was a need for a "new" foundation for the study of people communicating.

Franz Rosenzweig: 'Speech Thinking' Is Interpersonal

In his seminal work, **The Star of Redemption**[1], and his supplement to the **Star**, **The New Thinking** (1925), Franz Rosenzweig developed his understanding of the centrality of communication in life. Rosenzweig understood that communication scholars, like philosophers, must replace "thought" with <u>Speech Thinking</u>. Rosenzweig understood that the old ways of doing philosophy and social science were shattered with Hegel,

(who he called the last great philosopher,) and the crisis brought about by the death of Idealistic Philosophy just prior to the First World War. Idealistic philosophy is one-dimensional seeking to understand all life from a single systematic viewpoint. Truth was validated as a part of this absolute principle.

> The one-and-universal character of knowledge, including everything without exception, is formally one-dimensional. The ever multiple appearance of being is absolutely dissolved in the unity as in something absolute. A content may assume a particularly conspicuous position in this system, and belief makes such a claim for its content. But this position can only be that of the principle which, as method, consolidates the system itself as a unity. And precisely this position is accorded to the belief-content in Hegel's system. If we are to proceed another step beyond this peak without plunging into the abyss, then we have to shift the fundamentals; a new concept of philosophy must arise. (Rosenzweig, 1971, 104 - 105)

The Star of Redemption consists of three parts, the first details the old philosophical traditions of Idealism. The language of this part is different from that used in the other two parts. It is the dead, objective language of the empiricist which uses mathematical language because of its precision of expression. The language of parts two and three is personal and creative, even poetic, expressing the new lines which philosophy and the social sciences must explore. Rosenzweig's analysis revolved around the three acts of God: Creation, Revelation and Redemption. God spoke in the act of creation and bestowed on people the gift of speech. We speak at God's command and in response to God's revelation and redemption. This understanding of life allowed Rosenzweig to develop an unique understanding of history (Altmann, 1958). The death of Philosophical Idealism represented the end of the age of Greek Philosophy from Aristotle and the beginning of a Johannine age in the social sciences based on the dialogue with the Spirit: the Revelation. "But what, then, of the soul, the ready, the opened, the all-speechlessly hearkening soul? What can it reply to the commandment of love? The obedience to the commandment cannot remain mute. It too must become audible, it too become word. For in the world of revelation everything becomes word, and what cannot become word is either prior or posterior to this world..." (Rosenzweig, 1971, 178).

For Franz Rosenzweig, as well as for Martin Buber and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy,2 truth is not to be found in abstract thinking but in the dynamic communication transaction between people in relationship. "All spoken language places speaker and listener in a definite, concrete relation to truth. Thought, on the other hand, places us in an abstract, academic relation to it" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 42).

The new thinking, "Speech Thinking," understands that speech replaces thought -- the method of thinking in all earlier philosophies. While thinking is timeless and wishes to be timeless, speech is "bound to time and nourished by time, and it neither can nor wants to abandon

this element. It does not know in advance just where it will end" (Rosenzweig, 1961, 198 - 199). Speech Thinking requires the existence of another person who is not passive but totally involved in the communication transaction. Speech thinking is interpersonal. Thought is non-interpersonal. The thinker requires and desires no one else but him or her self. Thought does not require another person to occur or develop. Thought is, can be, indeed often is, done in solitude. While thought may sometime require only another person with ears, Speech Thinking requires another person who has ears and a mouth with which to reply. Thus speech knows nothing of the solitary "I" but only of people in relationship with one another. "'I' is always a Nay become audible. 'I' always involves a contradiction, it is always underlined, always emphasized, always an 'I, however.'...'I' is simple always willy-nilly subject in all sentences in which it occurs. It can never be passive, never object" (Rosenzweig, 1971, 173).

Speech thinking is spontaneous while traditional thought is prepared ahead of time. Rosenzweig contrasted the Socratic dialogues where Socrates "knows his thoughts in advance, and his expounding them is merely a concession to what he regards as the defectiveness of our means of communication," with the Gospels where Jesus does not spell out everything for his disciples but leaves them with mysteries which will be understood only later in the dynamics of their life experiences. The Socratic dialogues are rooted in traditional thought and philosophy while the Gospels are Speech Thinking.

Speech Thinking takes seriously the spontaneity and unpredicability of the response from the other and one's own unpredicable response. One may respond or may refrain from responding. We never know ahead of time if we will respond. Nor do we know how or what we will respond. In philosophical debates, where several philosophers meet together, there is a tendency for each to remain separate from the other. Rosenzweig affirmed that it is for this reason that many philosophical debates are so tedious. In actual conversations something happens. Real conversations require other people and take time seriously. "To require time means that we cannot anticipate, that we must wait for everything, that what is ours depends on what is another's" (Rosenzweig, 1961, 199).

Franz Rosenzweig knew that Speech Thinking is still a form of thought in the same manner that thought may be considered inner speech. It is the necessity of the other person which sets the two apart. It is the necessity to take the other person seriously and wait for his or her response which separate traditional thought from Speech Thinking. It is the affirmation that truth can only be found in the living relationship between people which makes Speech Thinking more dynamic and eventful than traditional social thought. Because of the basis of Speech Thinking relationships cannot be built through planning and strategy (Miller and Steinberg, 1975) but grow as the participants respond spontaneously and openly to one another. Time takes on new meaning, not as structured by thought, but as growth through communication/response.

For Franz Rosenzweig life is lived in the listening and responding of real people to God and one another. It does not consist of the

solitary work of the social philosopher isolated in his or her theory and research.

When people truly listen to one another community develops along with the ceremonies and rituals which keep that community vital. "The institution of listening in common became the promise of living in common. The community was called by a common name and so it responded, it began to exist" (Rosenzweig, 1971, 331). The activities of the community developed the common ritual and calendar which evolved centering on the holy days of community life and regeneration. The response to having been addressed by God is to trust by walking humbly with God, to be truly present to those persons with whom one comes into contact, and to find truth in the living of life with one another.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Speech as Social and Multifaceted

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy shared this understanding of the human situation with Franz Rosenzweig. His attack on modern social science, and especially Communication Theory, which he called "the vulgar philosophy of language", revolved around the unsociability and the unidimensionality of such theories. His understanding of "grammatical thought" led him from conceiving of people as singular entities with a single memory, love, will, or feeling. He understood that we live in a multidimensional world created by speech with a mutlifaceted existence based on inner and outer space and past and future time. Rosenstock-Huessy, like Martin Buber, rejected "Psychologism," the mistaken belief that reality exists within the mind of the individual person.

He noted that this is not a popular view. "People don't like this true picture of themselves." Most people would rather attribute to themselves constructs of "memory, love (or "will"), feeling, reason, in the singular, as something absolute." He saw this is the root of many misconceptions about grammar, speech, psychology and society.

> ...in this subtle replacing the plural "memories plus forgetting" by the proud singular "memory." If this were true every [person] were God almighty. He [she] would not need the rest of [human]kind for ...mastering reality...If [one] had "a" "memory," "a" "will," "a" "philosophy," etc. all for [one]self, [one] would go mad. Because [one] would have no means to know whether he [she] was true, real, valuable. Nobody else could tell him [her]. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 63)

People speak! To speak is to require another person. To use a language is to be involved in a social system, a culture, a family group, which requires and contains other people. Thus the method for Communication Theory, or any social science, is one which is not borrowed from the physical sciences based on empiricism or "stolen from theology" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 11) but is based on the study of language and speech.

Grammar, the grammatical method or "Metanomics" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969, 740 - 758; 1970a, 43; Tate, 1986) leads the social analyst to a multidimensional understanding of human life. "Medieval and modern thinkers never have laid claim to a method by which they could explain the changes in society. Hence, their present day disciples in the fields of history, ethics, psychology, sociology, economics, philology, who insist that our social knowledge must either be 'scientific' (the usual attitude) or cannot help be theologically informed, all do wrong to their own authorities" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 10).

Using the grammatical method, Metanomics, one comes to realize that life is lived on four different speech dimensions. We are all involved in speaking and listening, reflecting and articulating. Grammar teaches that the life of real people is interpersonal and multidimensional. Grammatical (Metanomical) analysis reveals that we live in a world of four dimensions: we are addressed (prejective or imperative speech, dramatic language), we reflect (subjective speech, pronominal language), we respond (trajective speech, narrative language), and we articulate (objective speech, analytical language). Life begins in the listening, followed by the response to the other, and then reflection and articulation. "The soul must be called **Thou** before she can ever reply I, before she can ever speak of **us** and finally it. Through the four figures, Thou, I, We, It, the Word walks through us. The Word must call our name first. We must have listened and obeyed before we can think or command" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1950, 12).

Grammatical Thinking, like Speech Thinking, requires the presence of the other person. It provides a basis for the study of communication because it understands the multidimensionality of personal response and change. Thought, as the basic reality of life, is supplemented and superceded by communication/response. The transactional understanding of communication is given a firm foundation with this multidimensionality of communication/response. Similarly the reality of process is strengthened because change is understood to occur naturally in response.

Rosenstock-Huessy provided two basic understandings of the personal situation in his two axioms: "Listen and we shall survive!" and "I respond although I will be changed." He understood and clearly taught that response always brings about change in the individual. Speech is the basic necessity of life. "Human survival and revival depend on speech" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 25).

Rosenstock-Huessy understood that the gramatical method reunites the researcher with the events he or she describes, by bringing into focus the researcher's "place in the temporal process of speaking and listening, teaching and studying." The myth of of the detached, objective researcher who is uninvolved in the social enviroment in which he or she works is being challenged in communication theory today (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). The researcher is involved in the world which he or she is studying. One must recognize one's place and role in this societal structure responding to the problems and concerns which people face in real life.

> ...The first outcry of human self-consciousness about society is the word: Listen! And as long as this word is not recognized as the corner stone of our whole building of a social science, this science will never come of age. "Audi, ut vivamus." "Listen and we shall survive," everybody is saying who talks at all on social questions. "Listen and society will live," is the first statement and the perpetual promise of any social research. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 23 - 24)

It should be obvious that Rosenstock-Huessy did not take speech lightly. He drew a distinction between the "vulgar philosophy of language" which says that speech exists merely to express ones thoughts and Metanomics which understands speech as the glue which holds society together. "If speech were intended to convey ideas, it would need as little power as possible. And it is true our modern speakers lisp tonelessly: they prefer to write form letters on a typewriter or send out mimeographed charts and statistics. They try to make as little noise as possible. They are right. Who am I that my opinions, thoughts or ideas should inconvenience anybody else?" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 81). This vulgar communication theory understands only "secondary types of speech." There is a source bias in much Communication Theory which emphasizes the egocentricity of speech. There has been, and still is, an emphasis on what a person can do to manipulate the other person or persuade the other person of the correctness of ones interpretation of life. Traditional communication theory can be expressed as follows: "I speak so that my thoughts, which I have prepared more less carefully beforehand in a logical persuasive order, may persuade the other person that I am correct. The I precedes speech to the other person" (Tate, 1986, 96). As noted above, for Rosenstock-Huessy, **Thou** is spoken first and precedes the development of the I. One cannot come into existence until first addressed by parents, grandparents, immediate relatives, and siblings.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy developed an understanding of speech which is complex and rooted in the social dynamic of relationship. For Rosenstock-Huessy speech is the "quintessential human experience" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 14). "When we are taught to speak, we are given the unifying orientation for our way through life with all other people" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 64). His analysis of speech led him to affirm the multiformity of life: listening, thinking, addressing, analyzing. Without other people who address us, enter into relationship with us, work with us, and support us through speech, we would, or could, not exist. "True partnership puts my mind at the service of my partner, and his [her] mind at my service. Our minds work much better for our partners than for ourselves. The Spirit is not given to [one] for [one]self. Self-reliance is an abuse of the greatest gift of the Spirit, or our reason" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1954, 21). When we take speech seriously as Communication scholars we also take seriously the personal-relational reality of existence.

Life, according to Rosenstock-Huessy, is lived in a multi-faceted space symbolized by the Cross of Reality. The Cross of Reality reminds us that life is more than thought. Thought is only one aspect of the process of living and communicating. The monologue of thought

is studied in philosophy. The dialogue of speech is studied in "Oratory" [Communication]. The plealogue of speech for future generations and future recollections is studied in literature and rhetoric.

TABLE ONE

Thought	Thinking	Monologue	Philosophy
Speech	Speaking	Dialogue	Oratory [Communication]
Future speech	Articulating	Plealogue	Literature
Address	Listening	Imperative	Politics

As Table One indicates Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy did not reject thought as an activity in which people participate but he did place it among the other activities which exist in the multiformity of life. He did reject the concept that we speak in order to express our thoughts (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 6; 1981, 14, 50; 1970a). One of the dogmas of modern science which he said must be rejected is that ones "words are merely means of expressing (one's) vapid thoughts." This dogma voids "our words of all meaning, and the last thirty years of catastrophe are the logical answer to them" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 6).

A further illusion of modern thought is to believe that one can think without speech (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 73). Here Rosenstock-Huessy stood with the Marxist linguist, V. N. Volosinov (1973) who also understood that speech is the basic social reality of life. It is social in that it occurs between people in a specific historical context. Both Rosenstock-Huessy and Volosinov strongly rejected the linguistic and psychological understanding that thought is mental -- occuring only within the mind of the individual (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1983, 49).4

Rosenstock-Huessy discussed the thinker and thought in some detail (1970a; 1981, 50 - 54). He taught that thought arises from a command, an order, to participate in the scientific process. Only when a thinker stands in a long line of progressing thinkers does one deserve the name. "The order which he [she] hears asking him [her] to solve this specific problem dates his [her] effort as meaningful in the strategy of science. It is [a] marching order, just like any soldier's, though he [she] articulates it only to himself [herself]" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 50). Thus the thinker stands in a continuum with other thinkers who have gone before and others who will come in the future, all who work on this problem. Thought is not an isolated phenomena. Even here the thinker is bound up in the social structure.

To think means to translate from one language to another language. Rosenstock-Huessy wrote that "thought does something to language, it kills words, for example" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970, 71). To speak is

to enter into a field of correspondence with the other person. Rosenstock-Huessy rejected the concept of field of reference since he understood that to speak is to risk the failure of communication (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 62; 1983). The field of correspondence comes into existence "by sayings and acts, and does not extend outside of them." For example, the imperative or command "Go!" can only be answered within the field of correspondence by going. "The field breaks down the separation of two 'self-contained' bodies; it gets 'under their skin,' and they act as a single will from the moment the order is given to the moment it is reported fulfilled. After this, the field collapses and disappears" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 47). To use the concept of a frame of reference is to conceive of something which stands apart from the speech and acts of the participants.

Speech places an individual in relationship with other people in a multifaceted world. It brings into existence grammatical space and time which are not abstract mechanistic concepts but "real challenges" to the speakers. It establishes inward and outward space, past and future time. "To speak means to believe in the essential unity of past experience, future destiny, inside feelings, and external sensations" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 64). The speakers stand on the narrow razor blade edge of the present linking the past and the future. As an illustration of this, in one of his essays on education, Rosenstock-Huessy (1981b) wrote about the teacher, who represents the experience and knowledge of the past through his or her life, and the student who represents the future, coming together in this present moment within the classroom. This fusion of past and future in the present through speech is central to his understanding of education as the "first embodiment of the new grammar of society" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 33).

Space and time present challenges to one because of the various speech activities in which they involve us. According to Rosenstock-Huessy, the problem with traditional linguistics and language theories is that they treated language as imperfect. For Rosenstock-Huessy:

> Language is a biological act. **Through speech human society sustains its time and space axis...**We sustain the time and the space axes of our civilization by speaking, because we take our place in the center of this civilization, confronted by its future, its past, its inner solidarity and its external struggle. And in this delicate and dangerous exposure to the four fronts of life, the inner, outer, backward and forward front, our words must strike a balance, and must distribute and organize the universe, in every moment. It is we who decide what belongs to the past and what shall be part of the future. Our grammatical forms in our daily speech betray our deepest convictions. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 59)

People are involved, then, in four types of speech which correspond to the four forms of grammatical usage and the four dimensions of life. The <u>inward</u> <u>aspect</u> stresses the "unity" of the speakers who know their oneness in agreement: pronominal language. (Pronouns: we, I, ours,

mine, you, thou, yours, thine, etc. Conjunctions: and, but, in spite of, etc. Optative, subjunctive: 'May she love me' or 'May I not live to see this happen.' Poetry, Music.) The outward aspect stresses the "freedom of each speaker who meets in the objective world: nominal language. (Nouns: candle, sunshine, tree, chair, etc. Indicatival speech. Mathematics, empirical research.) The backward aspect "traces everything to its familiar qualities: adjectival language. (Adjectives: red, green, good, bad. Participles: loving, gone, been. Historical background, moral judgement.) The forward aspect "accompanies the unfinished creation of the world of tomorrow: imperative language. (Verbs, imperatives: March! Go! Thy will be done, thy kingdom come -- or, Help! Stop! Listen! Political speech, education, prophesy.) (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 132). All four of these dimensions are necessary for life and society.

Since time and space, through their four dimensions, are real challenges, and not simply abstract concepts, we respond to these challenges always in an imperfect way. We all make mistakes. We all fail to respond adequately to the other.

> We have mentioned the fact that to speak involves the speaker in the risk of failure....The four fronts of life have built into every individual a 'bastion,' a foothold for themselves. We have memories towards the past, emotions about the inner space, reason for the outer space, and love for the future. However these powers fail us. Sometimes we forget instead of remembering. We hate where we ought to love. We are mad instead of using reason. And we remain indifferent where we might boil over.
>
> No mortal can boast of having reason, memory, love and complete feeling for all and everything. We have memories, and are forgetful; we have loves and hatreds in the plural; we have emotions and are indifferent; and we have reasons, and are unreasonable, or mad. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 62)

Language, according to Rosenstock-Huessy, brings people together in a social unity to overcome the individual forgetfulness, the hatreds, the indifference, or the madness which we possess and display in our individual responses to others. "We never 'have' 'reason,' 'memory,' 'salvation,' or 'sympathy' as a secure possession." Confusion replaces reason many times; forgetfulness, "a blank," destroys our memory; we remain neutral and indifferent instead of sympathetic; and possess fear instead of salvation. There is an essential unity to life. You cannot cultivate only reason without the other three dimensions.

> But since in our modern world everybody is allowed to speak and listen in all the four directions of reality, we can become masters of our destiny, conscious of our history, shot through with sympathy, and clear about nature. To speak means to sympathize, to clarify, to direct, and to know that you cannot have one of these

qualities when you do not cultivate the other three as well. [Emphasis added.]

In every moment, the four acts, clarification
consciousness
direction
sympathy
must be welded into one language. And they are thanks to the constant efforts of politics, science, the arts, and history-telling and history-writing.5 (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 65).

Only in the family does one still find these four languages being spoken. Here one finds the four directions of reality expressed in some meaningful fashion. Since time comes about because of speech the family also knows a different calendar than the technological-scientific calendar which hangs on our walls. The family calendar revolves around the traditions, birthdays, and holidays of the family. The technological-scientific calendar is divided into months and days irrespective of the cycles of family life. "Grammatical time and space precede scientific time and space" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 21) because they come from the speech and calendar of the family.

Mathematics has taken over the realm of the other three languages within the social sciences. Modern technology has changed not only the patterns of family and work life but also the "unity of all four tendencies of time and space" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 65).

Metanomics show how speech and time relate to one another. For Rosenzweig (1971, 272 - 297) and Rosenstock-Huessy (1949, 1950, 1954b) time is not simply a mental concept as Kant taught but rather it is uniquely bound up with and structured by speech. "Only because we speak, are we able to establish a present moment between past and future....By human speech, space and time are created" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 21). The act of speaking brings time into existence. It also structures time as one speaks and the other answers (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 49 - 51).

We now live in two different forms of time and calendars. Technological time is measured in seconds, minutes, hours, days, months, and years. This is the calendar of the industrial world coming into being after the Renaissance (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1949) and Descartes reformulated time into space and "pretended that a [person's] lifetime was nothing but a portion of the astronomical periods" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1966, 185). DesCartes abstracted technological time from "real time" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 97 - 98). Around 1700 in Holland they began to give prison sentences based on specific periods of time. This created what Rosenstock-Huessy called "a centimeter-view of time" (1978, 98) and gave status to the "state" which now had the right to establish laws for eternity. The Industrial Revolution further standardized time treating people as uniform entities who worked for specific periods of rigidly structured time (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1973). We now live in the realm of technological time with a calendar which the media has subdivided with pseudo-entertainment 'holidays' (Tate, 1985b).

Life cannot be fully lived in technological time. The cycles of life are those lived in "Fruitful Time" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 108 ff), slow time, God's Time, family time, speech time. When discussing education Rosenstock-Huessy (1970a, 31 - 44) affirmed that learning takes time. It cannot be done in the structured quarter or semester calendars of the modern university (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1954). We learn slowly with listening, reading, and rereading, until gradually we begin to understand. This also requires what Rosenstock-Huessy called the "happy vacuums" between school terms when no academic learning is required or even possible. We learn in Fruitful Time.

Relationships develop slowly in Fruitful Time. They cannot be rushed or sequenced into the structure of technological time. One of the criticisms made of developmental theories in Communication, Psychology, and Social Psychology is that they do not give a technological structure to human development. One cannot structure cognitive or relational development by the enumerated, "centermetered" technological calendar. All developmental models must be free of technological time and be understood only from the perspective of Fruitful Time. Rosenstock-Huessy is quite clear that education, relationships, peace, change, societal development, all must occur in Fruitful Time. In, **Planetary Service: A Way Into The Third Millenium**, Rosenstock-Huessy described the person who works for peace in the modern world as needing the perspective of a pirate. Pirate's have no allegiance to established movements and are free to live outside of technological time. They are free of the statisticians' uniformities and industrial structures which destroy people and groups. The pirate must slow things down in contradistinction to the speeding up of modern technology. The pirate knows a "voluntary patience," which accepts and employs the cycles and rhythms of personal life.

> I was screaming so rudely just now to stop you from crashing down into the technological age. Technology may concern itself with button-pushing, with speeding up time of earlier ages. We, however, have to replace the groups destroyed by technology, and to do that we must voluntarily slow down...Machines speed things up. The pirates' peace arises from a voluntary patience, an unexpected and technically unnecessary slowing-down. ...How is peace concluded? By re-establishing both a common time and a common calendar... (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 101- 103)

6

Martin Buber : Speech as The Hard Word

It may help to understand the necessity for a grounding of communication theory in Speech Thinking if we also remember Martin Buber's understanding of the contrast between the <u>easy word</u> and the <u>hard word</u>. It was not until Martin Buber made the distinction between the "easy word" and the "hard word" that he could write **I and Thou** (Friedman, 1981, 304 - 318). The "easy word" is speech without involvement, 'engagement' (Keltner, 1970), dialogue. The easy word leads to dialectic instead of dialogue. It is the speech of the "monological thinker"

who is always concerned with what he or she will say next. There is no relationship. There is no meeting with the other person. While Buber saw Socrates as one who did indeed many times enter into true dialogue with other people, he also saw the monological aspects of the Socratic dialogue.

Socrates did meet people, engage them in dialogue, trust them, never stopped speaking with them. While Buber was appreciative of these aspects of Socrates' life, he also saw the weaknesses in the Socratic dialogue. For Buber Socrates' "emphasis upon dialectical thought often put him in the position of the essentially monological thinker whose dialectic, even when it brings in other people, is little more than a moving forward through the opposition and interaction of different 'points of view' rather than an interaction between people" (Friedman, 1981, 312).

For Martin Buber, like Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, all speech is answering, responding. The "hard word" is that spoken in relationship, in response to the other person who stands with one in the historical situation, in response to the one who confronts him or her in the immediate situation. The "hard word" is spoken with the entire being.

Friedman has shown that this understanding of speech led Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber to a vital understanding of "existential thinking." This meant that "truth must be discovered and confirmed by the whole human being" (Friedman, 1981, 285). Truth cannot be understood in the abstract, as Idealistic Philosophy maintained, but only in the living, vital relationship between people. Like Rosenstock-Huessy they came to see that speech places people in a concrete relation to the truth. Truth is discovered and tested in the dialogues and relationships of ones life.

> The fundamental concept of the new theory of knowledge, wrote Rosenzweig in "The New Thinking," is that truth ceases to be what "is" true and becomes a verity that must be verified in active life. From the unimportant truths, such as "two times two are four," on which people agree with a minimum use of their brains, "the way leads over those truths for which man is willing to pay, on to those that he cannot verify save at the cost of his life, and finally to those that cannot be verified until generations upon generations have given up their lives to that end." (Friedman, 1981, 285)

Conclusion

"Why do people communicate?" The answer given by these seminal thinkers is that to communicate is to live. To be a person means that one communicates with other people. We are first addressed as "Thou" in prejective speech, as we respond-act on the imperative one becomes an "I", through reflexion the inner self comes into being, as one turns

to address another a relationship begins "We", and as one becomes known by others one becomes a "she," "he," "they," for objective analysis. Thought is not rejected but placed in among the other three dimensions of reality. Speech orients us in the world, with other people, in relationships, on a planet where we are called to work for peace by regrouping people after technology has destroyed the natural groupings of society. Speech does more than merely express our thoughts. It is the "quintessential human activity."

Because modern Communication scholars do not take speech and time seriously they deal only in the "unimportant truths" which people agree with easily. In two articles based on the work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, W. Thomas Duncanson (1985, 1986) has attacked the irrelevancy of modern speech/communication studies, with its emphasis on skill development, for the hard problems of life. We have also called for a "post-Marxian Critical Theory" of Communication which is strongly based in the work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and leads the communication theorist to apply his or her work to the advancement of world peace (Tate, 1985; Tate and McConnell, 1986).

This follows in the tradition of Rosenstock-Huessy and Franz Rosenzweig who worked to found adult education programs for ordinary people in Frankfurt after the First World War. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy discovered that his analysis of language and speech led him to leave the academic community and found the first worker's education program at Daimler Benz automobile works from 1918 - 1923. In the tradition of William James he was always seeking a "moral alternative to war" (see especially: Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969; 1973; 1978).

It is important to understand, we believe, that Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and Franz Rosenzweig were not "academic" scholars of speech/communication in the same sense that Martin Heidegger, Hans George Gadamer, Karl Jaspers and others who developed systematic philosophies of language can be classified. Rosenzweig and Rosenstock-Huessy were involved in the crises of their age. It was these social crises which brought together the members of the Patmos Circle7 for discussion and action. While Martin Buber emphasized the interpersonal orientation of dialogue, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy focused on the social problems people faced in the modern world. Both Martin Buber and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, however, knew that one cannot withhold oneself from the world and the social problems which face their age (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978; Buber, 1919).

> [Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy] and his friends were convinced that somehow [people] are driven together, and at the same time driven out of their particular niche in society precisely in order to survive and respond to those questions which have seized them. Recognition of the historical and temporal factors which condition all real speech and subsequent serious thinking was an insight which distinguished this circle, known as the Patmos group, from those scientists and intellectuals either ignorant of this fact or unwilling to accept its consequences. This serious speech about their times meant for them that as

> scholars **their** thinking and research must address itself to those questions which had been raised in **their** time. (Stahmer, 1966, xxvi)

Their response to the questions raised in their time was the establishment of the journal, **Die Kreatur**, with Martin Buber (Jewish), Joseph Wittig (Roman Catholic), and Victor von Weizsacker (Protestant) as editors. Rosenstock-Huessy summarized the experience of the publishers of **Die Kreatur** in these words:

> **The Creature** represented the sum of the struggles of Kierkegaard, Feuerbach, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, and William James. They had all discovered that no one has really anything to say, if they all say the same thing. The creature does not speak as God does. A husband does not speak as his wife, nor does a Christian as a Jew, nor a child as a professor. For that very reason and solely for that reason are they able to speak to, and must they speak to, one another...What the editors of **The Creature** discovered, were the spiritually nourishing processes experienced by genuinely speaking and existentially thinking persons. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1947, 209 - 210)

Faced with the overwhelming social problems of modern society, the compartmentalization of cultural and academic life, the lack of a common language able to bridge these gaps, people can only begin to, indeed must, speak with one another. Speech overcomes loneliness. Through speech people can begin to shape a common future.

The members of the Patmos circle found that the divisions common in the world and university became irrelevant because of their discussions and work. That the "niceties of the antitheses faith and science, capital and labor, object and subject, Protestant and Catholic, lost their vitality" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1959, 18). They committed themselves to developing a new norm based on their "extraordinary experience." In regard to the university Rosenstock-Huessy quoted comments by Kurt Ballerstedt: "How can a human being teach credibly of history, society or language in monologues? Only a human being who has lived and experienced the **thou** and the **we** in their fullness can reveal the **secret** of the university" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1959, 36).

While Martin Buber's analysis of speech led him to emphasize the personal dimension of dialogue, Rosenstock-Huessy's analysis of speech caused him to focus on the social realities and the methodological implications of speech as it spans generations. "Our historical mutability...is effective as a mental relation between two people, two generations, two times...In so far as we act or speak, we can act or speak meaningfully only between two generations preceding and succeeding us, because we always come too late to ourselves" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1966, 222). Rosenstock-Huessy disliked the concept of dialogue believing it was too limiting and did not adequately represent the reality of communication/response.

If the study of Communication is to be relevant to our modern age we must begin with the indubability of communication/response. We must leave behind the ancient shibboleth that we speak only to express our thoughts and explore the rich reality of speech through Metanomics. A metanomical analysis will lead us to confront the hard problems facing our time. It will illuminate ways in which we can begin to work for peace in a troubled world. Too often in the past our research and theory has been irrelevant to the basic questions and problems which people face in their daily lives.

It will teach us how to live in a world of two times -- Technological Time and Fruitful Time. It will help us as communication teachers to re-establish the rhythms of life with multiple calendars (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1954). A metanomical approach to Communication Studies will remind us that empirical analysis of communication is only one of four aspects of the discipline. The Cross of Reality compells the communication scholar to take seriously an interdisciplinary approach to the field because no one discipline or language can say it all. The Cross of Reality also reminds the scholar that he or she is involved as a person in all grammatical dimensions of life and one cannot divorce him or herself from the four "diseases of speech" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 10 - 19). This involvement also means that the researcher must understand himself or herself as a part of the research process. Research must be conducted in a manner which explores the role of the researcher as well as significant others in the life of people (Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Harre and de Carlo, 1985). The Cross of Reality also reminds us that quantitative and qualitative research are complementary to each other. Both types of research are necessary if we are to fully understand how and why people communicate. Finally, Metanomics leads us to the revitalization of education as the beginning of peace in the world. Such an approach to education will of necessity require new, non-traditional strategies of instruction (Tate and McConnell, 1985a; 1985b).

LISTEN, AND WE SHALL SURVIVE! I RESPOND, ALTHOUGH I WILL BE CHANGED! Metanomics, the science of speech, leads as Franz Rosenzweig wrote on the last page of **The Star of Redemption:**

INTO LIFE.

FOOTNOTES

1 It should be noted that **The Star of Redemption** was not considered by Franz Rosenzweig to be a religious book on Judaism but a philosophical book examining philosophy after Hegel.

2 Martin Buber was Franz Rosenzweig's close friend and coworker. Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy met in 1910. Each considered the other to be his alter-ego, "his partner in a common venture in behalf of the word" (Stahmer, 1968, 149).

3"Metanomics" from the Greek meta, beyond, and nomoi, laws. "I have justified in my book **Out of Revolution** my choice of the word "metanomics" for the organon and epistemology that is needed for any plunge into the material questions of society. I do not think that my choice is arbitrary. The terms ethics and meta-ethics are impossible, as a pair because of the highly specialized use of ethics as moral discipline. It seems impossible to restore to ethics the character of an empirical science. The empirical sciences feel that ethicists are concerned with standards more than with facts. Economists, sociologists, political scientists, historians, lawyers are the standard-bearers of the empirical knowledge in the social field. In this case, the term meta-ethics is useless for it would not be in clear opposition to those descriptive activities but to the moralizing ethics only. Metanomics rises beyond any partial and particular field of legislation of lawful functioning in society. It deals with the law of legislation in society. And it is in the enjoyable position, as a name, to be in clear polarity to the law as well as to economics" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 40 - 41).

4 While Rosenstock-Huessy and Volosinov lived at the same time it is apparent that they arrived at their understanding of language and speech independently of one another. That there are similarities in their thinking undoubtedly arises from the fact that both were influenced by the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt (1776 - 1835). Both also learned from Karl Marx although Volosinov understood that he was supplementing and improving Marxian perspectives on language while Rosenstock-Huessy understood himself as a post-Marxian thinker who understood the strengths and weaknesses of Marx's theory.

5 Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy was very specific about how "history-telling" and "history-writing" should occur. He rejected totally the historicism of modern departments of History and the many books of "history" which fill our libraries. His book, **Out of Revolution**, demonstrates convincingly how he believed history should be taught. Harold Berman, a former student of Rosenstock-Huessy's, has carried on his approach to history in his seminal work, **Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition**. (Berman, 1983, 1986; Stahmer, 1966, 1968, 1986; Gardner, 1981; Johannesen, 1986). Rosenstock-Huessy's concerns about the pedesterian writing of history were similar to those expressed by C. S. Lewis in his essay, "Historicism" (1977).

6

Buber was a friend and colleague of both Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. He worked closely with Franz Rosenzweig and eventually the two served as co-translators of a new German version of the Old Testament. With Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy he created the journal, **Die Kreatur**, serving as one of the three editors. Although there are major differences between the three friends, Martin Buber arrived at his understanding of dialogue seperately of the other two. It is now clear that Rosenstock-Huessy and Rosenzweig deeply influenced one another with Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy providing the impetus for what became Speech Thinking. Martin Buber shared their concerns and understanding of life.

7

Besides Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy other members of the Patmos Circle were Victor von Weizsaecker, Hans Eberhardt, Karl Barth, Leo Weismantel, Werner Picht, Hans Ehrenberg, and Rudolf Ehrenberg. The group met from 1915 - 1923 and eventually began their own publishing house and journal. Martin Buber and Joseph Wittig became associated with the group through their relationship with Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. Joseph Wittig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy wrote together a three volume history of the Christian Church (Huessy, 1986). Buber invited Wittig to join him as editor of **Die Kreatur** at the suggestion of Rosenstock-Huessy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altmann, Alexander. (1958). Franz Rosenzweig on History, in A. Altmann (Editor). **Between East and West: Essays Dedicated to the Memory of Bela Horovitz.** London: East and West Library.

Axelrod, Charles David. (1979). **Studies in Intellectual Breakthrough: Freud, Simmel, Buber.** Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press.

Berman, Harold J. (1986). Renewal and Continuity: The Great Revolutions and the Western Tradition, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 19 - 29.

Berman, Harold J. (1983). **Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition.** Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bryant, M. Darrol and Hans R. Huessy. (1986). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Buber, Martin. (1919; 1974). What Is to Be Done?, in **Pointing the Way.** Maurice Friedman (Editor and Translator). New York: Schocken Books. Pages 109 - 111.

Dance, Frank E. X. (1967). Toward a Theory of Human Communication, in Frank E. X. Dance (Editor). **Human Communication Theory: Original Essays.** New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Pages 288 - 309.

Dance, Frank E. X. (1970). The "Concept" of Communication, **Journal of Communication,** 20, 201 - 210.

Dance, Frank E. X. and Carl E. Larson. (1976). **The Functions of Human Communication.** New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Duncanson, W. Thomas. (1986). Mercenary or Pirate: Life in a Rhetorical Culture, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 109 - 122.

Duncanson, W. Thomas. (1985). In Service of Disagreement: The Multiformity of "No" in the Speech Thought of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, unpublished paper presented to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy Gesellschaft, West Berlin, August 1985.

Ford, Julienne. (1975). **Paradigms and Fairy Tales: An Introduction to the Science of Meanings.** Volume I. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Friedman, Maurice. (1981). **Martin Buber's Life and Work: The Early Years 1878 - 1923.** New York: E. P. Dutton.

Friedman, Maurice. (1983). **Martin Buber's Life and Work: The Middle Years 1923 - 1945.** New York: E. P. Dutton.

Gardner, Clinton C. (1986). From Theology to a Higher Sociology: The Promise of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 61 - 71.

Gardner, Clinton C. (1981). **Letters to the Third Millennium: An Experiment in East-West Communication.** Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Johannesen, Stanley. (1986). The Problem of American History in Out of Revolution, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 73 - 87.

Harre, Rom. (1983). **Personal Being: A Theory for Individual Psychology.** Oxford: Blackwell.

Harre, Rom and Paul F. Secord. (1972). **The Explanation of Social Behavior.** Oxford: Blackwell.

Harre, Rom and N. de Carlo. (1985). **Motives and Mechanisms: An Introduction to the Psychology of Action.** London: Methuen.

Huessy, Raymond. (1986). Joseph Wittig's Life, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 49 - 60.

Keltner, John. (1970). **Interpersonal Communication.** Belmont, California: Brooks Cole Publishing Company.

Lewis, C. S. (1977). Historicism, **Fern-seed and Elephants and Other Essays On Christianity.** London: Collins - Fount Paperbacks, pages 44 - 64.

Miller, Gerald R. and Mark Steinberg. (1975). Between People. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Potter, Jonathan and Margaret Wetherell. (1987). **Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour.** London: Sage Publications.

Rome, Sydney and Beatrice Rome. (1964). Philosophical Interrogations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rorty, Richard. (1979). **Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature**. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1949). Liturgical Thinking I, Orate Fratres, (November). [Reprinted in Rosenstock-Huessy Papers, Volume I. (1981b).]

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1950). Liturgical Thinking II, Orate Fratres, (January). [Reprinted in Rosenstock-Huessy Papers, Volume I. (1981b).]

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1954). Pentecost and Mission, The Hartford Seminary Foundation Bulletin, (Winter).

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1954b). Time Bettering Days, in **Rosenstock-Huessy Papers**, Volume I. (1981b). Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1966). **The Christian Future: Or The Modern Mind Outrun**. New York: Harper Torchbooks

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1969). **Out of Revolution: Autobiography of Western Man**. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1970a). **Speech and Reality**. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1970b). **I Am An Impure Thinker**. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1973). **The Multiformity of Man**. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1978). **Fruit of Lips or Why There are Four Gospels**. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Press.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1978). **Planetary Service: A Way Into The Third Millenium**. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1981). **The Origin of Speech**. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. (1981b). Man Must Teach: Sociology of Teaching and Augustine, **Rosenstock-Huessy Papers**. Volume I. Norwich, Vermont: Argo Books.

Rosenzweig, Franz. (1961). **Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought**. Nahum N. Glatzer (Editor). New York: Schocken Books. Second Edition Revised.

Rosenzweig, Franz. (1971). **The Star of Redemption**. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press.

Rosenzweig, Franz. (1925; 1953). The New Thinking, in **Understanding the Sick and the Healthy.** New York: The Noonday Press.

Stahmer, Harold. (1968). **Speak That I May See Thee.** New York: The Macmillan Company.

Stahmer, Harold. (1986). Christianity in the Early Writings of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 31 - 47.

Stahmer, Harold. (1966) Introduction to the Torchbook Edition, in Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. **The Christian Future or The Modern Mind Outrun.** New York: Harper Torchbooks. Pages vii - lv.

Stewart, John and Gary D'Angelo. (1980). **Together: Communicating Interpersonally.** Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Tate, Eugene D. (1986). Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Revolutionizing Communication Theory, in M. Darrol Bryant and Hans R. Huessy (Editors). **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Studies in His Life and Thought.** Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press. Pages 89 - 107.

Tate, Eugene D. (1985a). The Communication Theorist as Pirate and Argonaut: Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and Communication Theory, **The Canadian Journal of Communication,** 11 (3), 287 - 307.

Tate, Eugene D. (1985b). Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, Mass Media and Peace: Reassessing the Technological Advances in Communications, **Journal of Comparative Sociology and Religion,** 12, 38 - 61.

Tate, Eugene D. (1985c). Martin Luther in the Writings of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, in Walter Freitag, (Editor). **Festschrift: A Tribute to William Hordern.** Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Press. Pages 162 - 177.

Tate, Eugene D. and Kathleen McConnell. (1986). Communication Theory From The Perspective of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Towards a Post-Marxian Theory of Communication, unpublished paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Colorado, November 1986.

Tate, Eugene D. and Kathleen McConnell. (1985a). Afterword and Comment, Special Issue on Teaching the Critical Perspective on Communication, **Canadian Journal of Communication,** 11 (1), 123 - 131.

Tate, Eugene D. and Kathleen McConnell. (1985b). Reply to W. Thomas Duncanson, **Canadian Journal of Communication**, 11 (4), 425 - 427.

Volosinov, V. N. (1973). **Marxism and the Philosophy of Language**. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.